

Co., of Granite City, Ill., from East St. Louis, Ill.; and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration was alleged in that the strength and purity of the article fell below the professed standard under which it was sold, namely "Potency Per c. c. 25 Vitamin B (B₁) International Units," since it contained less than 25 vitamin B (B₁) International Units per cubic centimeter.

Misbranding was alleged in that the following statements appearing on the label were false and misleading when applied to an article that contained less than 25 vitamin B (B₁) International Units per cubic centimeter "Biologically Standardized * * * Potency per c. c. 25 Vitamin B (B₁) International Units."

On December 16, 1938, the case having been called and no claimant having appeared at that time, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

30013. Adulteration and misbranding of Biural Fitch. U. S. v. 25 Packages of Biural Fitch. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 44179. Sample No. 34304-D.)

This product was labeled to indicate that it was a solution of phenobarbital sodium suitable for parenteral administration; whereas it contained suspended crystalline material rendering it unsuitable for such purpose.

On October 17, 1938, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 packages of Biural Fitch at Washington, D. C.; alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 19, 1938, by William A. Fitch, Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, namely, (carton) "Ampuls * * * Each 2cc represents phenobarbital sodium 0.13 Gm. (2 grs.)," which created the impression that the article contained a solution of phenobarbital sodium suitable for parenteral administration; whereas it contained a considerable proportion of suspended crystalline matter rendering it unsuitable for such purpose.

Misbranding was alleged in that the statements on the carton and ampul, "Each 2cc represents phenobarbital sodium 0.13 gm. (2 grs.)," was false and misleading when applied to a preparation which was not a clear solution but contained a material amount of suspended crystalline material. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was offered for sale under the name of another article, namely, "Ampuls * * * Phenobarbital sodium 0.13 Gm. (2 grs.) Stabilized," that is, a solution of phenobarbital sodium suitable for parenteral administration.

On December 15, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

30014. Misbranding of Oxylin Greaseless Ointment. U. S. v. 16 Large and 24 Small Packages of Oxylin Greaseless Ointment. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 44235. Sample No. 41901-D.)

The labeling of this product bore false and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims.

On October 25, 1938, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 40 packages of Oxylin Greaseless Ointment at Trenton, N. J.; alleging that the article had been shipped on or about May 7 and September 29, 1938, by Evons Laboratories from Drexel Hill, Pa.; and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of small amounts of oxyquinoline sulfate, ethyl amino benzoate, camphor, menthol, and eucalyptol incorporated in a base of glycerin and potassium stearate.

Misbranding was alleged in that the following statements in the labeling regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent: (Carton and bottle) "Recommended for relief of skin irritations due to external causes, * * * burns * * * cosmetic skin, textile and